

Jacob Adams said:

I love life in the Arctic but it's harsh, expensive, and for many, short. My people want decent homes, electricity and education. We do not want to be undisturbed. Undisturbed means abandoned. It means sod huts and deprivation.

The native people of the Coastal Plain are asking for the same right of the Audubon Society of Louisiana, the same right this administration itself is supporting in the Russian Arctic Circle, and the same right the Gwich'ins had in 1984 when they offered to lease their lands.

The oil companies should have bought it. There just wasn't any oil there.

I recognize the public policy debate about this issue is complex and will involve issues at the heart of the extreme environmental agenda which is driving our energy policy. It certainly is not relieving it.

At the same time, I think the issue can be framed simply as: Is it better to give the Inupiat people, the people of the Arctic, this right?

These people live up here. This is an Eskimo village. There is the village. Do you want to give them the right, while promoting a strong domestic energy policy that safeguards our environment and our national security, rather than rely on the likes of Saddam Hussein to supply the energy?

The answer in my mind is clear, as well as in the minds of the Alaskans.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, if I may, I have been asked to announce speeches and I have just concluded one. On behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent, following the remarks of the majority leader, Senator FEINGOLD be recognized for up to 25 minutes as in morning business, to be followed by Senator SESSIONS, under the previous order, to be followed by Senator GRAHAM for up to 20 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Senator FEINGOLD be allowed to continue until the Senator arrives on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

H-1B VISAS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the Senate has just concluded its fourth vote in favor of the bill expanding H-1B visas that America grants each year to people from other countries to work in certain specialty occupations. I supported the bill on each of these votes.

But I rise today to express how strongly I oppose the manner in which the majority leader has sought to constrain this debate. I oppose the way in which the majority leader sought, on that bill, as with so many others, to prevent Senators from offering amend-

ments. And I oppose the majority leader's effort to stifle debate by repeatedly filing cloture on the bill.

Through his extreme use of cloture and of filling the amendment tree, I'm afraid the majority leader has reduced the Senate to a shadow of its proper self. And the result has been a Senate whose legislative accomplishments are as insubstantial as a shadow. This body cannot long exist as merely a shadow Senate.

Yesterday, as he brushed aside calls that the Senate vote on minimum wage or a patient's bill of rights, the majority leader complained that the Senate had already voted on those matters. But the Senate has, as yet, failed to enact those matters, and the people who sent us here have a right to hold Senators accountable.

And what's more, by blocking amendments, the majority leader has also blocked Senate consideration and votes on a number of issues that have been the subject of no votes in the Senate this year. Let me take a few moments to address two of them, the reform of soft money in political campaigns, and the indefensible practice of racial profiling.

Let me begin my discussion of these two items that the Senate was not allowed to take up—campaign finance and racial profiling—by discussing how those matters relate to what the Senate did take up—the H-1B visa bill.

The proponents of the H-1B bill characterize it as a necessity for our high tech future. It is both more and less than that.

But in a sense, the high-tech industry is certainly a large part of the reason why the Senate considered H-1B legislation these past two weeks. I would assert, that there is a high degree of correlation between the items that come up on the floor of the United States Senate and the items advocated by the moneyed interests that make large contributions to political campaigns.

American Business for Legal Immigration, a coalition which formed to fight for an increase in H-1B visas, offers a glimpse of the financial might behind proponents of H-1Bs. As I've said, I am not opposed to raising the level of H-1B visas. But I do think it's appropriate, from time to time, when the weight of campaign contributions appears to warp the legislative process, to call the Bankroll to highlight what wealthy interests seeking to influence this debate have given to parties and candidates.

ABLI is chock full of big political donors, Mr. President, and not just from one industry, but from several different industries that have an interest in bringing more high-tech workers into the U.S. I'll just give my colleagues a quick sampling of ABLI's membership and what they have given so far in this election cycle. All the donors I'm about to mention are companies that rank among the top employers of H-1B workers in the U.S., according to the

Immigration and Naturalization Service.

These figures are through at least the first 15 months of the election cycle, and in some cases include contributions given more recently in the cycle:

Price Waterhouse Coopers, the accounting and consulting firm, has given more than \$297,000 in soft money to the parties and more than \$606,000 in PAC money candidates so far in this election cycle.

Telecommunications giant Motorola and its executives have given more than \$70,000 in soft money and more than \$177,000 in PAC money during the period.

And of course ABLI is comprised of giants in the software industry, who have also joined in the political money game.

The software company Oracle and its executives have given more than \$536,000 in soft money during the period, and its PAC has given \$45,000 to federal candidates.

Executives of Cisco Systems have given more than \$372,000 in soft money since the beginning of this election cycle.

And Microsoft gave very generously during the period, with more than \$1.7 million in soft money and more than half a million in PAC money.

But I should also point out, Mr. President, that the lobbying on this issue is hardly one sided.

Many unions are lobbying against it, including the Communication Workers of America, which gave \$1.9 million in soft money during the period, including two donations of a quarter of a million dollars last year. And CWA's PAC gave more than \$960,000 to candidates during the period.

The lobbying group Federation for American Immigration Reform, or "FAIR," has lobbied furiously against this bill with a print, radio and television campaign, which has cost somewhere between \$500,000 and \$1 million, according to an estimate in Roll Call.

This is standard procedure these days for wealthy interests—you have to pay to play on the field of politics. You have got to pony up for quarter-million dollar soft money contributions and half-million dollar issue ad campaigns, and anyone who cannot afford the price of admission is going to be left out in the cold.

Thus, I believe that campaign finance is very much tied up in why the Senate considered the H-1B bill these past two weeks. I believe that campaign finance is very much tied up in why the Senate considered the H-1B bill under the tortured circumstances that it did. This is just another reason why I believe that this Senate must consider and vote on amendments that deal with campaign finance reform.

The momentum is building on campaign finance reform. In recent days, more and more candidates have offered to swear off soft money and have called for commitments from their opponents